

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1 and 7. These sheets, which include Figs. 1 and 7, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1 and 7.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (2 sheets)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application. No claims are amended, added, or canceled by the present response.

In the outstanding Office Action, the drawings were objected to; Claims 1, 3, 6-9, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Ichikawa (Japanese Patent Application JP 06-130818 A); Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ichikawa in view of Matsuzaki (Japanese Patent Application JP 08-106211); Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ichikawa in view of Isobe et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. U.S. 2003/0123889 A1, herein “Isobe”); Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ichikawa in view of Asanuma (Japanese Patent Application JP 06-083179 A); Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ichikawa in view of Aimoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,310,423, herein “Aimoto”); Claims 12, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ichikawa in view of Aimoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,391); and Claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ichikawa in view of Isobe.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, Figure 1 is amended to remove the reference character 9 and Figure 7 is amended to show a lead line for reference number 30. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 6-9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Ichikawa, that rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Briefly recapitulating, independent Claim 1 is directed to an image forming apparatus that includes, *inter alia*, a first measurement device and a second measurement device that measure first and second developer characteristics having first and second values,

respectively. The first developer characteristic is different from the second developer characteristic.

Turning to the applied art, Ichikawa discloses an image forming apparatus that has a first sensor 30 and a second sensor 31. The first and second sensors 30 and 31 of Ichikawa are used to determine a toner concentration and a developer degradation degree, respectively. However, as specifically stated in paragraph [0032] of Ichikawa, “the above-mentioned sensor 30 for toner concentration detection and the sensor 31 for developer degradation degree detection have the configuration as shown in (c) of drawing 4, and consist of a **permeability sensor of the same configuration**” (emphasis added).

In other words, Ichikawa discloses that the two sensors 30 and 31 are identical and measure the same developer characteristic, i.e., permeability. Based on the same toner characteristic (permeability), sensors 30 and 31 determine the toner concentration and the developer degrading degree. Thus, the measured permeability of Ichikawa corresponds to the claimed measured first developer characteristics, and consequently, sensors 30 and 31 of Ichikawa measure the same developer characteristic. However, the device of Ichikawa does not measure a second developer characteristic which is different from the first developer characteristic.

Applicant notes that the device of Ichikawa **detects only one** developer characteristic (permeability) and **determines**, based on the single developer characteristic, two other characteristics of the toner.

Therefore, Ichikawa does not teach or suggest a first measurement device and a second measurement configured to measure first and second developer characteristics having first and second values, respectively, the first characteristic being different from the second characteristics, as required by Claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Ichikawa.

Regarding the remaining outstanding rejections, Applicant respectfully submits that the applied art has been considered but none of it cures the deficiencies of Ichikawa discussed above. Further, the rejected claims depend from independent Claim 1, which is believed to be allowable as noted above. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 2, 4, 5, 10, and 12-17 are also allowable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.
Limited Recognition No. L0037

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
GJM/RFF:aif

I:\ATTY\RFF\24S\245716\245716US-AM-Nov9.DOC